Message

From: Davis, Mary J. [davis.maryj@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/22/2020 2:44:33 PM
To: Washington, John [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=fdc3e8ce9f1d45c4894881ff420ca104-Washington, John]; Davis, Mary J. [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=5a11c3a4da6248dfbaecd3465fe1ebc3-Davis, Mary]
Subject: Conversation with Washington, John

Davis, Mary J. 10:03 AM:

Hi John! I have a quick question about NJ data

Washington, John 10:04 AM:

Hi Mary

Davis, Mary J. 10:04 AM:

i wanted to confirm, you use alpha > 0.001 to determine LOQ, correct?

Davis, Mary J. 10:06 AM:

i realized that i'd used alpha >0.01 in the ClPFPECA data set, so I started correcting, then noticed you used "P>0.01" (t value corresponded to alpha >0.01) in your Legacies Veg set, which is what i'd originally modeled my data set off of... so i wanted to check

Davis, Mary J. 10:07 AM:

in summary, your soils data sets use 0.001 (and i believe you usually say 0.001) but the legacy veg set uses 0.01, so what should I use moving forward?

Washington, John 10:36 AM:

Hi Mary,

Washington, John 10:39 AM:

I would say at least 0.01 as minimum for LOQ. I don't have a concrete system at this point. My practice has been that if I notice all (or almost all) my samples that are >0.01 also remain significant at a more rigid threshold of significance, then I go ahead and set it at the more rigid level.

Washington, John 10:39 AM:

I don't know that this necessarily is best practice.

Washington, John 10:40 AM:

If you have it set at 0.01 presently, then I would leave it there.

Davis, Mary J. 10:40 AM:

okay, great. Thank you!

Washington, John 10:40 AM:

If they all are significant at the more extreme level, you could just note this in a clause of a sentence.

Davis, Mary J. 10:42 AM:

sounds good. I just wanted to make sure i could catch it if it was an error before the data report go too far along in review

Washington, John 10:42 AM:

Thanks!